



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,393	12/27/2000	Hiroshi Minagawa	SIP1P044	7511

22434 7590 07/29/2003

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

MCCARTNEY, LINZY T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2671

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/751,393

Applicant(s)

MINAGAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Linzy McCartney

Art Unit

2671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/27/00 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson, "3D Studio MAX 2 Fundamentals" (Peterson) in view of U.S. Patent 6,342,892 to Van Hook et al. (Van Hook) further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,322,448 to Kaku et al (Kaku) yet still further in view of Foley et al., "Computer Graphics: Principles and Practice" (Foley).

- a. Referring to claim 1, Peterson discloses generating a dummy object of said object by duplicating said object ("...performs Object motion blur by rendering multiple copies of selected objects..." – page 452, paragraph 2; page 455, Fig. 16.7) and determining a first position of said object and a second position of said dummy object so that said dummy object thus generated is positioned behind said object and overlaps only in part with said object when observed from a viewpoint, the orientation of said dummy object being the same as that of said object (page 455, Fig. 16.7, upper left, two leftmost disks in the figure.). Peterson does not explicitly disclose drawing said object at said first position and drawing said dummy object at said second position except for an overlapping portion between said object and said dummy object when observed from the viewpoint and wherein the drawing of said dummy object is in a second lightness different from a first

lightness of said object said second lightness being based on said first lightness. Van Hook discloses discarding overlapping portion between objects (“...z buffer value indicates that the previously written pixel is closer...the new pixel is discarded...thus accomplishing hidden surface removal...” – column 57, lines 4-8). Kaku discloses drawing of said dummy object is in a second lightness different from a first lightness of said object said second lightness being based on said first lightness (“...rendering is performed whilst applying...semi-transparency...the residual image being displayed in a more transparent fashion as the number frames by which it is previous is increased...” – column 22, line 58 – column 23, line 1; Fig. 35). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the program of Peterson to discard the overlapping portion between objects as taught by Van Hook and to draw a dummy object in a second lightness different from a first lightness, the second lightness being based on the first lightness as taught by Kaku. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because hidden surface removal is essential for a image to make sense (Foley, page 612, paragraph 3) and because applying semi-transparency to residual images creates a better dramatic effect (Kaku, column 22, lines 58-62).

b. Referring to claim 2, Peterson discloses the first position of said object and the second position of said dummy object are determined so that when observed from the viewpoint there is deviation between a straight line connecting a predetermined reference position of said object and the viewpoint and a straight line connecting the view point and a position in said dummy object corresponding to the predetermined reference position of said object (page 455, Fig. 16.7, upper left, two leftmost disks in the figure.).

c. Referring to claim 4, the modified program of Peterson as applied to claim 1 above meets the limitations recited in claim 4. As noted above, Van Hook discloses a hidden surface removal treatment using a Z-buffer (“...z buffer value indicates that the previously written pixel is closer...the new pixel is discarded...thus accomplishing hidden surface removal...” – column 57, lines 4-8) and using the Z-buffer to draw an object in a different lightness (“...depth comparator operates...with z buffer...to insure transparent values are blended properly...” – page 56, lines 59-61).

d. Referring to claim 5, the modified program of Peterson as applied to claim 1 above meets the limitation recited in claim 5. Kaku discloses the second lightness is higher than the first lightness (“...the residual image being displayed in more transparent fashion as the number of frames by which it is previous is increased...” – column 22, line 66 –column 23, line 1).

e. Method claims 8 and 9 recite steps performed by the program of claims 1 and 2; therefore, they are similar in scope and are rejected under the same rationale.

f. Claim 13 is rejected with the rationale of the rejection of claim 1. Claim 13 recites the additional limitations of a computer-readable storage medium storing a program for a video game which draws an object in a virtual space and a computer which reads out at least one part of said program from said recording medium to perform, by reading out at least one of said program from said storage medium. Kaku discloses the aforementioned limitations (“...the video game machine comprises...CD-ROM...reading application software supplied by...CD-ROM and generating a video...” – column 9, lines 41-45 and column 10, 37-44; Figs. 1 and 33).

- g. Claim 16 is rejected with the rationale of the rejection of claim 1. Claim 16 recites the additional limitations of a computer and a computer-readable storage medium storing a program executed by said computer. Kaku discloses the aforementioned limitations (“...the video game machine comprises...CPU block...CD-ROM...reading application software supplied by...CD-ROM and generating a video...” – column 9, lines 41-45 and column 10, 37-44).
- h. Claim 17 is rejected with the rationale of the rejection of claim 1.
3. Claims 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Van Hook further in view of Kaku yet still further in view of Foley as applied to claim 1 above further in view of U.S. Patent 5,579,454 to Billyard et al. (Billyard).
- a. Referring to claim 6, the modified program of Peterson as applied to claim 1 above meets the limitations recited in claim 6 except “...setting a distance from a view point of each polygon forming the object...” and “...drawing each polygon...in accordance with a drawing order of said polygons resulting from sequencing of said polygons from the greatest distance from the viewpoint...” However, Billyard discloses the “Painter’s Algorithm” a method in which polygons are ranked in order of decreasing distance from the viewpoint and then rendering the polygons in the aforementioned order (column 2, lines 35-42). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the program of Peterson by ranking the polygons in order and rendering the polygons in the aforementioned order as taught by Billyard. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been because it

would ensure that a correct picture results if the objects are rendered in that order (Foley, page 672, paragraph 2).

b. Claim 7 is rejected with the rationale of the rejection of claim 6. In the Painter's Algorithm disclosed in claim 6, only the pixel data closest to the viewpoint will be displayed on the screen.

c. Method claims 11 and 12 recite steps performed by the program of claims 6 and 7; therefore, they are similar in scope and are rejected under the same rationale.

d. Claim 14 is rejected with the rationale of the rejection of claim 6. Claim 14 recites the additional limitations of a computer-readable storage medium storing a program for a video game which draws an object in a virtual space and a computer which reads out at least one part of said program from said recording medium to perform, by reading out at least one of said program from said storage medium. Kaku discloses the aforementioned limitations ("...the video game machine comprises....CD-ROM...reading application software supplied by...CD-ROM and generating a video..." – column 9, lines 41-45 and column 10, 37-44; Figs. 1 and 33).

e. Claim 15 is rejected with the rationale of the rejection of claim 7. Claim 15 recites the additional limitations of a computer-readable storage medium storing a program for a video game which draws an object in a virtual space and a computer which reads out at least one part of said program from said recording medium to perform, by reading out at least one of said program from said storage medium. Kaku discloses the aforementioned limitations ("...the video game machine comprises....CD-ROM...reading application

software supplied by...CD-ROM and generating a video...” – column 9, lines 41-45 and column 10, 37-44; Figs. 1 and 33).

f. Claim 18 is rejected with the rationale of the rejection of claim 6.

g. Claim 19 is rejected with the rationale of the rejection of claim 7.

4. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Van Hook further in view of Kaku yet still further in view of Foley as applied to claims 1 and 8 above further in view of U.S. Patent 6,482,086 to Rimoto et al. (Rimoto).

a. Referring to claim 3, the modified program of Peterson does not explicitly disclose wherein said drawing, said dummy object is drawn before said object is drawn. Rimoto discloses the aforementioned limitation (“...The ball is not displayed on the display screen...the shadow of the ball...displayed...Fig. 3D...the ball is displayed...at the same time...” – column 10, lines 46-62; Fig. 3A-3E). At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to further modify the program of Peterson by drawing the dummy object before the object is drawn as taught by Rimoto. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to obtain a combination of operation support of a computer and the operation skill of the user (Rimoto, column 2, lines 19-24).

b. Method claim 10 recites steps performed by the program of claim 3; therefore, they are similar in scope and are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2671

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Linzy McCartney** whose telephone number is **(703) 605-0745**.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday (8:00AM-5:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Mark Zimmerman**, can be reached at **(703) 305-9798**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

ltm
July 17, 2003



**MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**